

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims 57, 58 and 72 under the second paragraph of section 112, objected to claims 64 and 65 as informal, rejected claims 43, 46 – 48, 52, 60, 61, 63, 73, 75, 77, 78 and 84 as anticipated by Plesski et al., rejected claims 64 – 68 as obvious over Plesski in view of Bauer, rejected claims 74 and 76 as obvious over Plesski in view of Amano, rejected claims 79 – 83 as obvious over Plesski, indicated that claims 44, 45, 49 – 51, 53 – 56, 59, 62, 69 – 71 would be allowable if redrafted in independent form, indicated that claims 57 and 58 would be allowable if redrafted to overcome the section 112 rejection and in independent form, and cited prior art of record but not relied upon.

### **Allowable Claims**

Applicants note with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter. Claims 44, 50, 54, 56, 59 and 62 have been redrafted in independent form and are therefore in form for immediate allowance.

Claim 49 is amended to be of a scope sufficient to cover the embodiment shown in Figure 4, Figure 7 and Figure 11. The scope of the claim is not limited by these figures, however.

The dependent claims have generally been amended to depend from either claim 44 or new claim 85.

### **New Claim**

A new claim 85 is added. This claim is similar to newly independent claim 44 but with both interdigital transducers arranged in the parallel branch. For example, Figure 3 shows parallel transducers in a parallel branch. Applicant submits that the claim defines allowable subject matter and requests favorable consideration and allowance thereof.

### **35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> ¶**

The claims 57 and 58 have been amended to address the objection.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 72 is in compliance with section 112. In particular, claim 72 provides that the transversal gap is less than or equal to one quarter wavelength. This is not inconsistent with claim 71 calling for the gap to vary. Withdrawal of the rejection is hereby requested.

### **35 USC §102 and §103**

The claims that were rejected over the prior art have either been cancelled or amended to depend from an allowable base claim. As such, Applicants submit that the rejection is thereby overcome.

### **Additional Art**

The additional art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon is noted by the Applicants.

### **Deposit Account Information**

The Commissioner is authorized to deduct any additional fees or credit any surpluses to deposit account 501519.

### **Conclusion**

The present application has been placed into form for immediate allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the present application is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

 (#31,870)

Melvin A. Robinson  
Schiff Hardin LLP  
Patent Department  
6600 Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312-258-5785  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT